

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached New sheet of drawings include a New Fig. 2.

Attachment: New Sheet

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-42 are pending in this application.

Claims 8 and 19-42 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, and 18 are rejected.

Claims 3-4, 10-11, and 16-17 are objected to.

Drawing Objections

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), stating that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More specifically, the Office Action objected to the drawings because the first output circuit responsive to the sensor signal and providing a first output is not shown and the second output circuit responsive to the sensor signal and providing a second output signal as claimed in claims 1, 8 and 14 are not shown. Applicant respectfully submits a new drawing sheet 2 which shows the sensor signal going directly to the first and second outputs. Furthermore, Applicant has amended the specification after ¶ [0008] to include the description of the new drawing. Additionally, ¶ [0011] has been amended to discuss what new Figure 2 shows. Applicant maintains that new Figure 2 is not new matter and support can be found in ¶ [0011]. Entry of the drawing and specification amendments is respectfully requested. As such Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objection to the drawings.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12-14, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12-14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,552,531 to Fey, (hereafter Fey '531). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12-14, and 18.

The law is clear that anticipation requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every limitation of the claim sought to be rejected. The law is also clear that a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate all the limitations of the claim from which it depends.

With regard to independent claim 1 and dependent claims 5-7 which depend from independent claim 1, Applicant maintains that Fey '531 does not disclose "said shared circuits including circuit elements used by both the first and second output circuits" as stated in independent claim 1. The specification of Fey '531 discloses a modulator (4) that controls the current source (5) in dependence on the output signal of the sensor element and an optional data signal by way of an input port. See col. 2, lines 53-58. There is nothing in Fey '531 that discloses circuit elements of the modulator or the source being used by the first and second output circuits as discloses in claim 1 of the present application. For this reason alone Fey '531 does not anticipate claim 1 and claims 5-7 which depend from claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 and 5-7 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Applicant maintains that Fey '531 does not render claims 1 and 5-7 obvious. The specification of Fey '531 teaches that the filters (FS1, FS2) filter the output pulses generated from the modulator (4). See col. 2, lines 64-67. Clearly the specification of Fey '531 teaches that the filter circuits receive output pulses and there is nothing in the specification that would teach or suggest the sharing of circuitry by the

filters with the modulator or source of Fey '531. Therefore Applicant concludes that independent claim 1 and dependent claims 5-7 could not be rendered obvious by Fey '531.

Applicant will now address the rejection of independent claims 1, 9 and 14 as well as dependent claims 5-7 and 12-14 which depend from independent claims 1 and 9 respectively. It is Applicant's position that Fey '531 does not disclose a shared circuit as set forth in independent claims 1, 9 and 14. The Office Action indicates that the shared circuit is shown in the drawings and description of Fey at reference numerals 4 and 5. A review of the drawing and specification of Fey '531 states that reference numeral 4 is a modulator and reference numeral 5 is a current source. See col. 2, lines 53-55. The current source is not a circuit, in fact the specification of Fey '531 states that the modulator controls the current source. See Fey at col. 2, lines 55-56. If the current source 5 of Fey '531 had its own circuitry it would not rely on the modulator 4 for control. There is nothing in the specification of Fey '531 that discloses that the current source has circuitry. Clearly reference numeral 5 is not a circuit that is shared therefore, Fey '531 would not disclose all of the elements of rejected claims 1, 5-7, 9 and 12-14. For all of the above reasons Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection and allowance of the rejected claims.

Applicant further maintains that Fey '531 would not render obvious rejected claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12-14 because there is nothing in the specification or drawings of Fey '531 that would teach or suggest a shared circuit. As established above, a current source 5 is not a circuit but instead is a current source that is controlled by the modulator 4. Therefore, Fey '531 does not teach or suggest a shared circuit as set forth in the rejected claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the abase claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for this allowed matter; however at this time Applicant has not resubmitted or placed those claims in allowable form since Applicant believes that their respective base claims are allowable.

Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 8 and 9-42 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the above amendments and remarks the claims 1, 3-14 and 16-42, as presented, are patentably distinguishable because the cited patents, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or render obvious, the present invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that the pending claims are properly allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 364-4300 if any unresolved matters remain.

P.O. Box 70098
Rochester Hills, MI 48307
(248) 364-4300

Dated: May 21, 2007

PRW:GLO:cah

Respectfully submitted,

WARN, HOFFMANN, MILLER & OZGA, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By: 

Philip R. Warn
Reg. No. 32775